

REMARKS

In the June 15, 2007 Office Action, the specification and claims were objected to and claims 1-10 stand rejected in view of prior art.

Status of Claims and Amendments

In response to the June 15, 2007 Office Action, Applicant has amended the specification as indicated above and added new claims 11-18. Thus, claims 1-18 are pending, with claims 1 and 2 being the only independent claims. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of the following comments.

Specification

In paragraph 1 of the Office Action, a statement of a claim for priority in the specification was requested. In paragraph 2, the title of the invention was objected to for not being descriptive. In response, Applicant has amended the specification to add a claim for priority and to amend the title.

Claim Objections

In paragraph 3 of the Office Action, the sequence of the claims was objected to. Applicant believes that the dependency of the claims is clear and the renumbering of claims can be done upon allowance. Just as the dependency of claims 9 and 10, which were added in the preliminary amendment, is clear, so too is the dependency of claims 3, 7 and 8. New claims 11-18 have been added by this amendment. Because they are newly added these claims are out of order yet the dependency is clear. As MPEP §608.01(n) IV. states, the order of claims may change during prosecution. The Examiner can renumber the claims anyway she sees fit upon allowance. Withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0141888 (Bostwick).

Independent claim 1 recites an air guide that guides the air flow so that the revolving direction velocity decreases when blown out from the cooling air hole to the side of the main plate opposite the electric motor. This is ***not*** disclosed or suggested by Bostwick or any other prior art of record.

Bostwick discloses a radial fan 10 with a center plate 20. A void 48 is at the ***center*** of the fan 10. Referring to Figure 6 of Bostwick, it can be seen that air is ***not*** blown out from the void 48 to the side of the center plate 20 opposite the motor 64. Indeed, as described in paragraphs [0014] and [0015], air is ***drawn in*** from the ***center*** of the fan 10 and forced radially outward. Specifically, paragraph [0015] states that “[t]he air drawn through the electromotive device to the center of the plate second surface is then pushed radially outward along the second plurality of fan blades.” See also paragraph [0036] for a description referring to Figure 6.

While paragraph [0032] states that the fan 10 can operate in two directions of rotation and can be mounted at either axial end of the device, the blades of the Bostwick design, ***draws in*** cooling air at the center of the fan 10 from axially opposite ends of the device. See paragraph [0010].

Moreover, Bostwick does not disclose that a revolving direction velocity decreases when blown out from a cooling air hole. It appears that Official Notice has been taken that revolving direction velocity decreases. It is unclear how revolving direction velocity decreases when blown out from the void 48 when air is not blown out from the void 48 as

detailed above. Nevertheless, in accordance with MPEP §2144.03, Applicant hereby demands support of the Official Notice with adequate evidence that revolving direction velocity decreases when blown out from the void 48. Applicant asserts that it is not common knowledge that revolving direction velocity decreases when blown out from the void 48 in Bostwick. Referring to Figure 5, the design of the fan 10 in Bostwick has an absence of structure around the void 48 such that a revolving direction velocity would not decrease. Indeed, air is not blown out from the void 48 to a side of the center plate 20 opposite the motor 64. Rather, as illustrated by arrows 108 in Figure 6, the Bostwick fan 10 is designed to draw in air toward the center of the fan 10.

Independent claim 2 recites an air guide that guides the air flow so that it is blown out toward the side of the main plate in the counter rotational direction when blown out from the cooling air hole to the side of the main plate opposite the electric motor. This is *not* disclosed or suggested by Bostwick or any other prior art of record.

Regardless of paragraph [0032], which states that the fan 10 can operate in two directions of rotation and can be mounted at either axial end of the device, Bostwick does not disclose air flow that is blown out toward the side of the main plate in the counter rotational direction. Referring to Figure 6 of Bostwick, there is nothing to indicate that the air is blown out in the counter rotational direction. Furthermore, Bostwick does not disclose air flow that is blown out toward the side of the center plate 20 in the counter rotational direction when blown out from the void 48 to the side of the center plate 20 opposite the motor 64.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 2 are not anticipated by the prior art of record. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Moreover, Applicant believes that dependent claims 3-10 are also allowable over the prior art of record in that they depend from independent claim 1 or 2, and therefore are allowable for the reasons stated above.


Also, the dependent claims are further allowable because they include additional limitations. For example, claims 8 and 10 are directed to an air conditioner comprising a heat exchanger. Bostwick does not disclose an air conditioner comprising a heat exchanger arranged on an outer peripheral side of the centrifugal fan. The Office Action calls a stator 68 a heat exchanger on page 7. It is unclear how the stator 68 of the motor 64 can be considered a heat exchanger. Furthermore, the stator 68 is not arranged on an outer peripheral side the fan 10.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendment and comments, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1-18 are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


David J. McCrosky
Reg. No. 56,232

SHINJYU GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
(202)-293-0444
Dated: August 29, 2007

S:\08-AUG07-YTY\DK-US020672 Response.doc